Case 3:14-cv-02390-MMA-MDD Document 1 Filed 09/15/14 PageID.1 Page 1 of 6

3

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

1920

21

21

22

2324

25

3. Count III of Plaintiff's Complaint is based on Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 28 U.S.C. § 227 et seq. (TCPA).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. Jurisdiction of this Court over Counts I and II or Plaintiff's Complaint arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1367 grants this court supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims contained within.
- Jurisdiction of this Court over Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 6. Defendant conducts business in the State of California thereby establishing personal jurisdiction.
- 7. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

PARTIES

- 8. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Ceres, Stanislaus County, California.
- 9. Defendant is a business entity with a principal place of business in San Diego, California.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. In or around June of 2013, Defendant began constantly and continuously places collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt.
- 12. Plaintiff's alleged debt arises from transactions for personal, household, and/or family purposes.

- June 27, 2014: three (3) calls;
- June 28, 2014: one (1) call;
- June 29, 2014: three (3) calls;
- June 30, 2014: one (1) call

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 19. Defendant violated the FDCPA based on the following:
 - a. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy Plaintiff;

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, MELBA BUSH, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC., for the following:

- 20. Statutory damages pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. 1692k;
- 21. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. 1692k;
- 22. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

COUNT II DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 23. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all of the allegations in Count I of Plaintiff's Complaint as the allegations in Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 24. Defendant violated the RFDCPA based on the following:
 - a. Defendant violated § 1788.11(d) of the RFDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously to annoy the person called;
 - b. Defendant violated § 1788.11(e) of the RFDCPA by communicating with

Plaintiff with such frequency as to be unreasonable and to constitute a harassment to Plaintiff.

- c. Defendant violated § 1788.17 of the RFDCPA by failing to comply with the Fair Debt Collection Practices, Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.*, to wit:
 - 1. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff;
 - Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with intent to annoy, harass, or abuse Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, MELBA BUSH, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC. for the following:

- 25. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code §1788.30(b),
- 26. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ Code § 1788.30(c), and
- 27. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

COUNT III

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS ACT

- 28. Defendant's actions alleged *supra* constitute numerous negligent violations of the TCPA, entitling Plaintiff to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 29. Defendant's actions alleged *supra* constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violates of the TCPA, entitling Plaintiff to an award of \$1500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

- - the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(b) and 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(C);
 - 32. All court costs, witness fees and other fees incurred; and
 - 33. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

9

10

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

DATED: September 15, 2014

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KROHN & MOSS, LTD.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Attorney for Plaintiff

Ryan Lee

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

By: /s/ Ryan Lee

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, MELBA BUSH, demands a jury trial in this case.